

Mr. David Wrone
RR 5, Box 464
Stevens Point, Wisc. 54481

3/17/76

Dear Dave,

Glad to get your 3/14 and particularly glad that Floyd has been of help to your young people. I spoke to Leopold about him and about the books.

Some of this time with the young people is seminal and the result is quite gratifying. Yesterday I was telling Jim that the difference between the lanes and the Buds and the Floyds is that Floyd learns, is willing to learn and wants to. But it is really more than that, as I learned last night with a surprise call. He has others working with him and they in turn learn from two. Two very fine girls were home in Erie, Pa. for the semester break. They arranged to be on two local TV shows and the local newspaper, all for today. They then are driving back to give Downing support tomorrow.

All of this can be more important if, as its records forecasts, Congressional moves now fail. The great danger from failure now is that for a while it can be fatal. This is one of the reasons I'm not getting involved in the ego-tripping and other foolishness, so I'll not be tainted by it and will remain with credibility and capability if there is the coming failure. If all of this comes to pass, or if nothing does, these young people can be very important in keeping the question alive, at least on campuses.

I'll be responding until the phone rings with Playboy, for which I'm a consultant on some really terrible assassination pieces. When you see how bad they are in print you'll not be able to imagine what there were in manuscript.

On the books: as I told Leopold we observe normal trade practice, with discounts and with returns. We do take unsold books back for full credit, asking only that they be insured against damage on return so we can resell them. As you may not know, we are now down to slightly damaged books on I and III but have not raised the price to out-of-print rates.

I can't imagine what basis there can be for your #3 store saying it "has not been able to get the books from" me. Unless, perhaps, they have not paid in the past, which I doubt. Lil would normally discuss this with me. (She is at work now.) I'll check with Lil about City News but it is not clear what you mean by men giving this a little thought.

If you have any faculty connection at Madison why not try to arrange for me to be there and take the nuts head on? There may be some who remember my 12/66 appearances, especially a very nice woman who arranged a seminar with selected students after my speech, rather late. I also held other seminars then. I then stayed several days, with Jim's friends Dennis Berger and Richard Levine. The ways things are going it could be an added advantage to the rational ones of the nut-influenced because they may well be disillusioned again and need a view of hope. And adversity. And proper determination rather than unthinking bullheadedness. If there is a prospect of this and especially if they have a black studies program and/or significant black enrollments or interests I could go two nights straight, once on JFK and once on MLK, but only as part of the regular program of these things, not in some semi-underground arrangement.

Milwaukee and AIB/Belin/Carrison. Both are crazy in the same and different ways. Fact is immaterial to both and both represent fiction as fact. Each substitutes his own wish. Belin is easier. I never had a chance to read, correct and shorten the speech I prepared for him at Vanderbilt but the content, even if cut to a couple of his more serious misrepresentations, failures and suppressions, is strong. Then the question will be to get him to respond, which he never does, and not to go into long non-responses. After the first merely say now that you have made your speech how about responding: explain why and how you omitted Bowley from your report and work and witness list. Ditto with Carolyn Arnold. Why did you not confront Givens. How can you say shells kill when bul-

lets do and unlike him the FBI, which may not be as expert in explanation despite its long practise, said it could not connect any one of the Tippit Bullets with that pistol. ~~Which~~ Which might remind you that he also managed not to report that the first shell found was for an automatic, one that could not possible have fit into that pistol.

In short, pick a few good, ahhd items and persist with them and after the first time interrupt when he starts making diversionary speeches claiming they are explanation. If you do thos persistently and politely it will b e clear to the audience and he may, after the heavy does I gave him - and not knowing what else you'll do and say - blow. It will be something if he does. I think he may not be crazy enough to go, but that Garrison's presence might tempt him.

I'd not tackle both at once were I you. You can

Hours later, after disagreeableness with Playboy, which is engaged in a wholesale ripoff besides rotten stories. This reminds me: I hope you kept notes on Anson.

I think what I had in mind is suggesting that you ignore Garrison if you are not alone with him, taking the all-the-flowers-bloom approach, not of agreement and having nothing to do with the Shaw debacle unless you can't avoid it. Not that you compromise your integrity. That you merely let him and Belin slug it out. Meanwhile, you slug Belin on his own record.

If you are alone with Garrison you have a different situation. The easiest course there is to have nothing to do with the Shaw part, saying merely that you have not looked into it and know only what was in the papers. But, that the judge ruled ~~no~~ evidence of any rather than the alleged conspiracy wa s admissible and that part of the case, which was reported, does destroy the Report. (I gave him almost all of that before I knew what his claimed case was, when I deiassociated myself.) You can use the Frazier and Finck stuff from Post Mortem, which Jim never recognized because I did not deal with him on it.

The AIB stuff ought be no problem. Just tear it up and scatter it to the airwaves. It will do much to help credibility. including yours.

It will not srprise Jess and the others, for I've warned them and they say they know it and have th e same name but are not part of Cambridge. Unless they are part of Cambridge, I don't see how this would "further force" them "into a false position." Further straightening them out, if they need it, helps them. But if you have to confront it there is your own integrity.

Hope you can make out the typos. In haste, with
best

This gancy stationery is wasted sheets of 3M paper. I had a nervous, insecure local student copy the unread ms of my Watergate book for Jim. The wasted sheets are being used, first where I can to eliminate a stack.

Dear Dave,

later 3/17/76

Lil recalls no orders from your City News. She says as I did, that the only orders we ever turn down are from those she remembers as not paying. She has no recollection of them at all. As I think you know, we filled the other orders promptly.

Barton J. Bernstein's "We Almost Went To War," Foreign Service Journal as reprinted in Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, is interesting, as your note indicates. If it fails to go where it should it goes farther than previous writing on this.

I'd appreciate it if one of your students could undertake either to get copies of what has been declassified or a list of what has been on this subject. The footnotes are rather small for my eyes. Where I checked them I believe the source was the Kennedy Library.

I'll pay, of course. I'm also assuming it isn't thousands of pages.

It is also interesting that, if I read the explanatory note correctly, only part of this was in FSJ. Wonder why they didn't use all? Or what was not used - and if there is anything in the content that might indicate the reason.

Best,